

### **3. Remarks**

The Examiner has rejected pending claims 1-20. The applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 9, and 16. Claim 2 has been cancelled. No claims have been added.

#### *A. Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 101*

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 as being directed to non-patentable subject matter in that they do not recite the statutory class to which they are tied or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed. Claims 1 and 3 have been amended for purposes of clarification. The applicant respectfully suggests that no amendments are necessary to claims 4-8, which are each dependent upon claim 1.

#### *B. Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103 (claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 9-18)*

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 9-18 as being unpatentable over US2004/0019794 to Moradi et al. in view of U.S. 6,263,330 to Bessette. The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

Bessette is recited for teaching, at column 3, lines 57-66, a unique identifier (URL) to patient medical data. The unique identifier is defined as a pointer, that is, a physical address for where data is located using the URL addressing scheme. Claims 1, 9, and 16 have been amended to recite a unique prescription identifier that is generated either by sequential or pseudo-random assignment. (This limitation is supported in the specification at paragraph

[0046].) A pointer cannot be generated in this manner, since a pointer must match an actual physical address of the desired data in order to be useful. The unique prescription identifier of the present invention, by contrast, is not used as a pointer to a physical address, but rather serves the purpose of uniquely identifying particular prescriptions, and thus it need not match any physical address in a database. For this reason, the applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination does not render the claimed invention obvious, and the rejected claims are therefore allowable.

*C. Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103 (claims 8 and 20)*

The Examiner has rejected claims 8 and 20 as being unpatentable over US2004/0019794 to Moradi et al. in view of U.S. 6,263,330 to Bessette and in view of US2004/0006490 to Gingrich et al. The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

Each of claims 8 and 20 are dependent upon one of the claims for which allowability was discussed above over Moradi et al. in view of Bessette. For the same reasons as presented above in connection with the claims from which these claims 8 and 20 depend, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejected claims are allowable.

*D. Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103 (claims 6 and 19)*

The Examiner has rejected claims 6 and 19 as being unpatentable over US2004/0019794 to Moradi et al. in view of U.S. 6,263,330 to Bessette and in

view of U.S. 6,973,435 to Sioufi et al. The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 6 and 19 are dependent upon one of the claims for which allowability was discussed above over Moradi et al. in view of Bessette. For the same reasons as presented above in connection with the claims from which claims 6 and 19 depend, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejected claims are allowable.

*E. Conclusion*

With the amendments made herein and for the reasons provided above, the applicant asserts that all claims in the application are allowable, and reconsideration and allowance is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

---

11/04/2009

/chuck dougherty/

---

Date

Reg. No. 41,715  
Telephone: (501) 371-0808  
Facsimile: (501) 376-9442  
**Customer No.: 47990**

J. Charles Dougherty  
Wright, Lindsey & Jennings LLP  
200 W. Capitol Avenue, Suite 2300  
Little Rock, AR 72201-3699